

## WTWG Minutes for August 21, 2006

Dave Brown, Stuart Crane, Paul Dempsey, Melissa Downs, Urban Eberhart, Chuck Garner, Ken Hasbrouck, Carron Helberg, Stan Isley, Steve Johnson, Paul LaRiviere, Chris Lynch, Larry Martin, Tom Ring, Charlie Roe, Jeff Slothower, Tom Tebb, Ron Van Gundy

Chuck Garner called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed. Stan Isley had a few corrections to submit, and he said he would send them to Carron Helberg.

CG continued with the next agenda item to the first new proposal 2006-21 for Peltola. Jeff Slothower started to explain this proposal by saying that the water right was confirmed in sub basin 4, Williams Creek flows into Swauk Creek. It has two points of diversion and a change in diversion to pump directly from Williams Creek. The Conservancy Board confirmed this proposal and went through it. He continued by talking about the stock water right and the conveyance water right. September 4<sup>th</sup> is the deadline with Ecology for review. SI asked is it a total of 20 af on both areas, as it seemed high. Larry Martin commented that it is consistent with the testimony. Paul LaRiviere asked if it is a move downstream. JS replied yes, less than a mile. Tom Ring asked if it is appurtenant to the place of use. JS replied that it is the quantity confirmed in court. JS proceeded to read from the court document. He admitted the language is different than in other places. CG asked that water right is not in question. JS said right, the Conservancy found no issues. TR asked how much was awarded, and JS replied 0.8 cfs. JS, TR and PL discussed the physical aspects of the ditch and the amount of cfs (conveyance quantity). JS added he is moving his Qi and Qa to the new point of diversion. TR asked concerning the conveyance issue, if we are going to see a document that shows a decrease in the amount in the ditch. SI commented that we could in the approval documents to include the statement to clarify the reduction. JS said this is moving the POD, he cannot take it at the old POD and the new POD. SI explained the court wording and said it is clumsy wording. TR said he has trouble with the dangling conveyance water. LM said it is shared in common with whoever is still on the ditch. SI and TR explained how this works and the 0.4 water right that the ditch enjoys. JS said Peltola loses the right to the conveyance water. TR had two questions: 1) How do we know someone is not taking it and what assurance do we have. 2) Is it making the ditch inefficient, quantity-wise? He sees some logic problems and regulatory issues. Tom Tebb asked is there some numbers when it becomes less efficient. TR feels the abuse of the water is the issue and not the increase in the CU. LM/SI discussed the checks and balances. JS asked is it a recreational area right now, or is it just pasture? PL asked is it screened. JS replied no. TR asked is the water always available the entire year. The times it is dry before (old diversion), is it dry at the new diversion? After a brief discussion, it was asked if this proposal is recommended. The group recommended this proposal.

The group continued to the next agenda item 2006-22 for Rogalski-Wallgren Inc. with JS explaining this proposal. This is a move up river, domestic use, no increase in CU. TR asked is there an existing well, and JS replied yes. TR and JS discussed the existing water use, the CU, and does the period of use change with a reply of no. SI said it will not change the TWSA historic place of use. TR asked is it fallowed. JS said all of it. SI, PL, and JS discussed the CU, fallowed land, and the conveyance water. TR commented that they are moving the water right and not the conveyance water. JS and TT discussed putting language in to keep people from trying to do something with the water after five years. TR would like Ecology to find out if it is legal to leave the conveyance water behind. JS reminded the group that time wise, this expires on 9-5-06 for review. TT added he will try to address this by then. LM commented that they are leaving it so there is not impairment on the ditch. JS said this represents 1% and 99% is still there. PL and SI discussed the difference between Teanaway and this proposal. JS then read from the court document and it gave the ditch the right (supplement for sub basin 5). Stuart Crane asked about the 0.6, where does it go. It is not conveyance or water right, and asked if it stayed in the river. TR commented it is return flow. CG asked if the group is ok with this proposal. The group recommended it.

The group continued with the last new proposal 2006-23 for Col Solare LLC with Charlie Roe and JS explaining this proposal. Charlie Roe explained the change in purpose of use, need for lots of water to convey this water right, to enhance the water flow for Reecer Creek, and a water management plan. There is no change in season of use but an increase in acres. JS added how the water will flow all the way through and explained the location of the measuring devices. LM, JS, TR, TT and PL discussed how it would be operated. They also discussed the number of fallowed acres, repairs, and the loss of shrubstep. Steve Johnson is excited about developing this. TR, PL and TT asked about how to meter and be comfortable with it. TT added that they are looking for oversight, who will "mind the store". TR added that the extra flows would benefit Reecer Creek. SI added that there are downstream fish benefits and another water right to track by Reclamation. The group recommended this proposal even though still in Ecology review. JS said he would email to CH the management plan to distribute to the entire group.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 PM